

manway; that escaping miners would be in fresh air entirely from all areas on the 1300 level; and that its approximately 3,300 feet from the No. 3 shaft areas down 13-1 drift to the No. 2 shaft station and approximately 4,800 feet from 13-17 drift off 13-5 drift to the No. 2 shaft station by 13-17 drift. The petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method would provide at least the same measure of protection as would the mandatory standard.

Request for Comments

Persons interested in these petitions may furnish written comments. These comments must be filed with the Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Room 627, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. All comments must be postmarked or received in that office on or before August 7, 1995. Copies of these petitions are available for inspection at that address.

Dated: June 29, 1995.

Patricia W. Silvey,

Director, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances.

[FR Doc. 95-16627 Filed 7-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-43-P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (95-051)]

Agency Report Forms Under OMB Review

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of Agency Report Forms Under OMB Review.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), agencies are required to submit proposed information collection requests to OMB for review and approval, and to publish a notice in the Federal Register notifying the public that the agency has made submission.

Copies of the proposed forms, the requests for clearance (OMB 83-1), supporting statements, instructions, transmittal letters, and other documents submitted to OMB for review, may be obtained from the Agency Clearance Officer. Comments on the items listed should be submitted to the Agency Clearance Officer and the OMB Paperwork Reduction Project.

DATES: Comments are requested by August 7, 1995. If you anticipate commenting on a form but find that time to prepare will prevent you from

submitting comments promptly, you should advise the OMB Paperwork Reduction Project and the Agency Clearance Officer of your intent as early as possible.

ADDRESSES: Donald J. Andreotta, NASA Agency Clearance Officer, Code JT, NASA Headquarters, Washington DC 20546; Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (2700-0073), Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bessie B. Berry, NASA Reports Officer, (202) 358-1368.

Reports

Title: Small Business and Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns and Related Contract Provisions—NASA FAR Supplement Part 18-19.

OMB Number: 2700-0073.

Type of Request: Extension.

Frequency of Report: Quarterly.

Type of Respondent: Business or other for profit, Not-for-profit institutions.

Number of Respondents: 295.

Responses Per Respondent: 3.

Annual Responses: 885.

Hours Per Response: 16.21.

Annual Burden Hours: 14,346.

Number of Recordkeepers: 0.

Annual Hours Per Recordkeeping: 0.

Annual Recordkeeping Burden Hours: 0.

Total Annual Burden Hours: 14,346.

Abstract-Need/Uses: NASA requires more frequent reporting of small disadvantaged business subcontract awards in order to more effectively manage its goal for small disadvantaged business participation.

Dated: June 29, 1995.

Donald J. Andreotta,

Deputy Director, IRM Division.

[FR Doc. 95-16549 Filed 7-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-M

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Cooperative Agreement for Design Access: Civiscape

AGENCY: National Endowment for the Arts, NFAH.

ACTION: Notification of availability.

SUMMARY: The National Endowment for the Arts requests proposals leading to the award of a Cooperative Agreement for a project titled, "Design Access: Civiscape." The objectives of Civiscape are: (1) To implement and maintain innovative digital forums for the design community and interested audiences in the arts that are accessible by the Internet; (2) To provide the design

community and interested audiences in the arts with outstanding working examples of innovative and/or experimental designs for interfaces, navigational systems, information environments, and other integral components of interactive online information systems; (3) To develop software tools specifically for the needs of artists and designers; (4) To provide basic online digital reference and access services; and (5) To develop and implement non-digital forums (a symposium, conference, etc.) that brings together the design community, interested artists, citizens, and technology experts to demonstrate emerging technologies and discuss Civiscape in the context of current issues relating to online interactive communications. Funding by the Endowment is limited to no more than \$200,000. Respondents to the Solicitation are requested to indicate the value of any contribution to the program that they are able to offer, such as donations of staff time, space, materials, equipment, indirect costs, or other important elements. Those interested in receiving the Solicitation should reference Program Solicitation PS 95-07 in their written request and include two (2) self-addressed labels. Verbal requests for the Solicitation will not be honored.

DATES: Program Solicitation PS 95-07 is scheduled for release approximately July 24, 1995 with proposals due on August 24, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Requests for the Solicitation should be addressed to National Endowment for the Arts, Contracts Division, Room 217, 1100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20506.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William I. Hummel, Contracts Division, National Endowment for the Arts, 1100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20506 (202/682-5482).

William I. Hummel,

Director, Contracts and Procurement Division.

[FR Doc. 95-16629 Filed 7-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 72-16, 50-338/339]

Virginia Electric and Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of a Materials License for the Storage of Spent Fuel and Notice of Opportunity for a Hearing

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the NRC) is considering an application dated May 9, 1995, for a materials

license, under the provisions of 10 CFR Part 72, from Virginia Electric and Power Company (the applicant or VEPCO) to possess spent fuel and other radioactive materials associated with spent fuel storage in an independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI) located in Louisa County, Virginia. If granted the license will authorize the applicant to store spent fuel in a dry storage cask system at the applicant's North Anna Nuclear Power Plant site for Units 1 and 2, (Operating Licenses NPF-4 and 7). Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR Part 72, the term of the license for the ISFSI would be twenty (20) years.

Prior to issuance of the requested license, the NRC will have made the findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the NRC's rules and regulations. The issuance of the materials license will not be approved until the NRC has reviewed the application and has concluded that approval of the license will not be inimical to the common defense and security and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the health and safety of the public. The NRC will complete an environmental evaluation, in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51, to determine if the preparation of an environmental impact statement is warranted or if an environmental assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact are appropriate. This action will be the subject of a subsequent notice in the **Federal Register**. Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.105 and 2.1107, by August 7, 1995, the applicant may file a request for a hearing; and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene with respect to the subject materials license in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 2.714. If a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the NRC or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel will rule on the request and/or petition, and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order. In the event that no request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the NRC may, upon satisfactory completion of all required evaluations, issue the materials license without further prior notice.

A petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding and

how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order that may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend a petition, without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the holding of the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the action under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfied these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C., by the above date. Where petitioners are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the NRC by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to William D. Travers, Director, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards: Petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and to Michael W. Maupin, Esq., Hunton and Williams, Riverfront Plaza, East Tower, 951 E. Byrd Street, Richmond, Virginia, 23219, General Counsel for the applicant.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

The Commission hereby provides notice that this proceeding concerns an application for a license falling within the scope of section 134 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (NWPAA), 42 U.S.C. 10154. Under section 134 of NWPAA, the NRC, at the request of any petitioner or any party to the proceeding, must use hybrid hearing procedures with respect to "any matter which the Commission determines to be in controversy among the parties." The hybrid procedures in section 134 provide for oral argument on matters in controversy, preceded by discovery under the Commission's rules, and the designation, following argument, of only those factual issues that involve a genuine and substantial dispute, together with any remaining questions of law, to be resolved in an adjudicatory hearing. Actual adjudicatory hearings are to be held on only those issues

found to meet the criteria of section 134 and set for hearing after oral argument.

The Commission's rule implementing section 134 of the NWA are found in 10 CFR Part 2, subpart K, "Hybrid Hearing Procedures for Expansion of Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage Capacity at Civilian Nuclear Power Reactors," (published at 50 FR 41662, October 15, 1985). Under those rules, any party to the proceeding may invoke the hybrid hearing procedures by filing with the presiding officer a written request for oral argument under 10 CFR 2.1109. To be timely, the request must be filed within ten (10) days of an order granting a request for hearing or petition to intervene. (As outlined above, the Commission's rules in 10 CFR Part 2, subpart G continue to govern the filing of requests for a hearing or petitions to intervene, as well as the admission of contentions.) The presiding officer may grant an untimely request for oral argument only upon a showing of good cause by the requesting party for the failure to file on time and after providing the other parties an opportunity to respond to the untimely request. If the presiding officer grants a request for oral argument, any hearing held on the application shall be conducted in accordance with the hybrid hearing procedures. In essence, those procedures limit the time available for discovery and require that an oral argument to held to determine whether any contentions must be resolved in an adjudicatory hearing. If no party to the proceeding requests oral argument, or if all untimely requests for oral argument are denied, then the usual procedures in 10 CFR Part 2, subpart G apply.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application dated May 9, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20555, and at the local public document room at the Special Collections Department, Second Floor Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903-2498. The Commission's licenses and Safety Evaluation Report, when issued, may be inspected at the above locations.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of June, 1995.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William D. Travers, Director,

Spend Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 95-16524 Filed 7-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 5-278]

PECO Energy Company; Public Service Electric and Gas Company; Delmarva Power and Light Company; Atlantic City Electric Company; Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption to the PECO Energy Company, et al. (the licensee) for the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS), Unit 3, located in York County, Pennsylvania.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant an exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.D.1(a). Section III.D.1(a) requires a set of three Type A tests (i.e., Containment Integrated Leak Rate Test (CILRT)) to be performed at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period and specifies that the third test of each set shall be conducted when the plant is shut down for the performance of the 10-year inservice inspection (ISI). The request involves a one-time schedular exemption from the requirements of Section III.D.1(a) that would extend the PBAPS, Unit 3 Type A test service period and allow the three Type A tests in the current service period to be performed at intervals that are not approximately equal. Hence, this one-time exemption would allow the third, Unit 3, Type A test to be performed during refueling outage 11, scheduled to begin in September 1997, approximately 70 months after the last Unit 3 test, thereby coinciding with the 10-year plant ISI refueling outage.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated November 21, 1994.

Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required in order to allow the third Type A test to be performed during the eleventh Unit 3 refueling outage scheduled to begin in September 1997, concurrent with the 10-year plant inservice inspections. Without the exemption, the licensee would be required to perform a Type A test during both refueling outage 10, scheduled to begin in September 1995 and refueling outage 11. Performing the Type A test during two consecutive refueling outages would result in increased personnel radiation exposure and increased cost to the licensee. With the exemption, the third Type A test would be performed during the eleventh

Unit 3 refueling outage which would thus align the start of the third 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, 10-year service period with the start of the third 10-year ISI period.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed the evaluation to the action and concludes that this action would not significantly increase the probability or amount of expected primary containment leakage. The performance history of Type A leak tests at PBAPS, Unit 3, demonstrates adequate margin to acceptable leak rate limits. No time-based failure mechanisms were identified that would significantly increase expected leak rates over the proposed extended interval. The three historical Type A test failures at PBAPS, Unit 3, in April 1977, September 1981 and August 1983, were determined to be activity-related failures, which would not be related to an extended test interval. Thus radiological release rates will not differ from those determined previously and would not be expected to result in undetectable leak rates in excess of the values established by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J.

Consequently, the probability of accidents would not be increased, nor would the post-accident radiological releases be greater than previously determined. The proposed action does not otherwise affect radiological plant effluents or increase occupational radiation exposures. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that this proposed action would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted areas as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the action would be to deny the request. Such action would not reduce environmental impacts of plant operation and would result in increased radiation exposure to plant personnel.